



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,430	09/07/2000	HIDEKI NAGATA	15162/02430	1547

24367 7590 12/31/2002

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 NORTH HARWOOD  
SUITE 3400  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/657,430

Applicant(s)

NAGATA ET AL.

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

*Handwritten mark*

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2674

### DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1-20 are pending. The examination results are as following.

1. A Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been considered when the Application is in condition for allowability.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-6, 9-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lechner (US patent 6,190,172).

4. Regarding claim 1, Lechner discloses in figure 1 that an image display system or comprising at least two screen (14, 16) onto images are projected; at least one display device

Art Unit: 2674

(12) for display the images that are to be projected onto the screens (see column 6, lines 21-47 and column 7, lines 21-31), a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens (see column 8, lines 15-22, because the width of the displayed video image on each side screen is less than the height of displayed video image); and at least one projection optical system (28) for projecting the images displayed on the display device onto the screens (see figure 1, column 8, lines 52-55).

5. Regarding claims 2-4, Lechner discloses in figures 6-8 that an image display system, wherein the projection optical system (28) includes a mirror (42) that reflects the images from the display device toward the screen (see figure 6-8); the display device displays in different orientations the images projected by way of the mirror and the images projected not by way of the mirror (see figures 6-8, column 7, lines 59-67, because the screens 14, 16 has different direction); and wherein the screens (14, 16, 18) form inner wall faces of an observation room for housing an observer (see figure 5).

6. Regarding claims 5-6, Lechner discloses in figures 4-5 that wherein the display device is arranged outside the observation room (see figure 4); and wherein a total number of projection optical system (28) is equal to the total number of the display devices (12) (see figure 4).

7. Regarding claims 9-10, Lechner discloses in figure 5 that wherein a total number of projection optical system (28) is equal to the number of the screen (12) (see figure 4); and wherein the display device displays simultaneously the images projected onto the screen (see figure 5).

8. Regarding claim 11, Lechner discloses figure 1 that a method of building image display system or comprising at least two screen (14, 16) onto images are projected; at least one display device (12) for display the images that are to be projected onto the screens (see column 6, lines 21-47 and column 7, lines 21-31), a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens (see column 8, lines 15-22, because the width of the displayed video image on each side screen is less than the height of displayed video image); and a step of installing at least one projection optical system (28) for projecting the images displayed on the display device onto the screens (see figure 1, column 8, lines 52-55); and a step of projecting the images displayed on the display device through the projection optical system onto the screens (see figure 5).

9. Regarding claims 12-14, Lechner discloses in figures 6-8 that a method of building an image display system, wherein the projection optical system (28) includes a mirror (42) that reflects the images from the display device toward the screen (see figure 6-8); the display device displays in different orientations the images projected by way of the mirror and the images projected not by way of the mirror (see figures 6-8, column 7, lines 59-67, because the screens 14, 16 has different direction); and wherein the screens (14, 16, 18) form inner wall faces of an observation room for housing an observer (see figure 5).

10. Regarding claims 19-20, Lechner discloses a method of building an image display system in figure 5 that wherein a total number of projection optical system (28) is equal to the number of the screen (12) (see figure 4); and wherein the display device displays simultaneously the images projected onto the screen (see figure 5).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 7-8 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lechner (US patent 6,190,172) in view of Yamazaki et al. (US patent 5,579,026).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Lechner discloses in figure 1 that an image display system or comprising at least two screen (14, 16) onto images are projected; at least one display device (12) for display the images that are to be projected onto the screens (see column 6, lines 21-47 and column 7, lines 21-31), a total number of display devices being smaller than a total number of screens (see column 8, lines 15-22, because the width of the displayed video image on each side screen is less than the height of displayed video image); and at least one projection optical system (28) for projecting the images displayed on the display device onto the screens (see figure 1, column 8, lines 52-55). However, Lechner does not disclose that wherein the projection optical system includes a shutter that is opened and closed of the images displayed on the display device. Yamazaki discloses a liquid crystal shutters of the A-glass to open and close of the images displayed on the display device (see column 11, lines 37-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Yamazaki as disclosed above in the device and method for producing the claimed

Art Unit: 2674

invention because this would help the user open or close of the images displayed on the display at the same time.

13. Regarding claims 7 and 17, Lechner discloses that the display device or method of building an image display system that wherein in the step of installing the display device, wherein the display device is arranged outside the observation room (see figure 4); and wherein a total number of projection optical system (28) is equal to the total number of the display devices (12) (see figure 5). However, Lechner does not disclose the display device displays on a time-division basis the images to be projected onto the screens. Yamazaki et al. disclose the displaying different images with time-division of two or more different three-dimensional images (see column 32, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Yamazaki et al. as discussed above in the device of Lechner for producing the claimed invention because this would provide a plurality of information simultaneously using an identical screen and allow a plurality of image information independently, and so on.

#### *Response to arguments*

14. Applicant's argument filed on 10-15 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Lechner does not teach the total number of display devices is smaller than a total number of screens". However, this argument is not persuasive due to the teaching of Lechner as discussed above. Therefore, this rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 2674

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number (703) 308-0425.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessfully, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D. C. 20231

**Or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only).**




Art Unit: 2674

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone  
number is (703) 306-0377.

Kimnhung Nguyen  
December 26, 2002



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600